

## REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-60 and 62 are currently pending in this application as amended through Amendment A filed November 1, 2004.

In this amendment, Claims 21, 30, 31, 34-41, 44-46, 48 and 49 have been amended.

Claims 43 and 61 have been canceled without prejudice to filing a continuation with respect thereto.

Claims 22-29, 32, 33, 42, 47 and 50 remain unchanged.

Claims 1-20, 51-60 and 62 have been withdrawn and remain unchanged.

Applicants have amended independent Claims 21 and 41 to more clearly define the inventive coupler of the present invention. Claim 21 has been amended to provide that the coupler includes a tube which receives the pipe segments, a seal which seals between the tube and the pipe segments and a keying element. Claim 41 has been amended to provide that the tube of the coupler seals with the pipe segments. These amendments to Claims 21 and 41 do not add new matter. Additionally, the amendments to Claims 21 and 41 are not believed to affect the Examiner's grouping of the claims.

Additionally, Claims 30, 31, 34-40, 44-46, 48 and 49 have been amended to correct typographical errors, to correct a lack of antecedent basis, and to correct dependency. Claim 43 has been canceled. These amendments were not made for purposes of patentability. Rather, they make the claims clearer and more readable.

Initially, Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner's assertion that Applicants' election to the first restriction requirement was made without traverse. As set forth in the response filed November 1, 2004, Applicants requested that the Examiner redraw the restriction requirement in three different possible ways. Applicants renew their request that the Examiner redraw the original restriction requirement as set forth in one of the alternatives set forth on page 18 of the November 1, 2004 response.

In the Action of April 14, 2005, the Examiner entered a second restriction requirement. The current restriction requirement is a 6-way species/sub-species type restriction. In the table below, the claims corresponding to the six species noted by the Examiner have been set forth.

Group	FIGS.	Covered by Claims:
I	6-11	21, 25, 30, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 41-50
II	12-15	21, 25, 29,
III	16-17	21, 22, 23, 24
IV	18-21B	21, 25, 30, 34, 38, 40
V	22-23	21, 25, 30, 31, 32, 33, 38
VI	As described on page 8 of the application where the key is a separate pin element that engages an axially extending bore	21, 25, 26, 27, 28, 30, 31, 32, 33, 38


Applicant elects with traverse to proceed with Species I, FIGS. 6-11, Claims 21, 25, 30, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 41-50. Applicant notes that at least Claim 21 is generic to all six species and that at least Claim 25 is generic to species 1, 2, and 4-6.

Appl. No. 10/765,633  
Amdt. dated May 20, 2005  
Reply to Office action of April 14, 2005

Should the Examiner have any comments or suggestions regarding the claims to be examined, the Examiner is urged to call Applicants' undersigned attorney.

Dated: 5/20/05

Respectfully Submitted,



Jonathan P. Soifer, Reg. No. 34,932  
Polster, Lieder, Woodruff & Lucchesi, L.C.  
12412 Powerscourt Drive, Suite 200  
St. Louis, Missouri 63131  
Tel: (314) 238-2400  
Fax: (314) 238-2401  
e-mail: Jsoifer@patpro.com